

on the road to Santa Clara approximately 5 km southeast of Iquitos. Vegetation here was similar to that in the first site studied but included the genera *Balsa*, *Ochroma*, and *Croton* among the secondary plants. I counted nine individual "fee-bee-o"s along a line of trees bordering a dirt road for approximately $\frac{1}{2}$ km. After numerous tests with the "fitz-bew" playback the birds were located by playing the "fee-bee-o" song at each apparently suitable habitat. In each case the bird appeared only briefly and emitted either a very subdued "fee-bee-o" or, more frequently, a series of "pit"s. At times during the playing three birds could be heard "pitting" in response to the "fee-bee-o"s from the speaker. The birds appeared to respond intensely or aggressively for an initial period of about 10 minutes, but soon retired, still emitting a few "pit"s, to the crowns of the line of trees. A series of trials was then made playing only the "pit" call, which I found in Connecticut, as suggested by Stein (Proc. Amer. Phil. Soc., 107: 29, 1963), to be given only by "fee-bee-o"s and never by "fitz-bew"s (Gorski, MS). In several cases a bird flew within $\frac{1}{2}$ m of the speaker and model. The only special movement accompanying its "pitting" was the tail-pump and in one case a crest raise and slight "kitter" sound. The responding birds seemed momentarily extremely curious about the sounds, but soon left the vicinity of the speaker. Attempts to measure the total area traversed by individual birds were complicated by the number of birds in the line of trees. Denseness of the undergrowth also hindered an adequate survey, but the birds seemed to be spaced about 60 m apart along the line of trees, which were separated from the road by a grassy field.

It was not feasible to obtain tape recordings of the calls of any of the Peruvian birds and no specimens were collected, but on the basis of the behavioral and vocal response to recordings played, I am sure the birds in Peru belonged to the "fee-bee-o" songform.

Financial support was obtained from the Chapman Fund of the American Museum of Natural History, the Explorer's Club, and National Science Foundation Grant GB-4306X to the University of Connecticut. Suggestions on an earlier version of the manuscript were given by G. A. Clark, Jr., A. H. Brush, and J. A. Slater. Access to Traill's breeding areas in Connecticut was generously provided by the White Memorial Foundation, Inc. I thank the curators of the American Museum of Natural History for access to study skins and Eugene Eisenmann for his valuable assistance in the preparation of this paper. Field work and identification of plants was greatly aided by Sidney McDaniel.—LEON J. GORSKI, *Department of Biology, Central Connecticut State College, New Britain, Connecticut 06050*. Accepted 17 Jul. 70.

Injured Calliope Hummingbird lifted by another.—One day about mid-June of 1968, during the early part of the usual nesting season of the species in this locality, a female Calliope Hummingbird (*Stellula calliope*) flew against a window in my office and fell to the ground, where it lay stunned and motionless. Almost immediately a male bird of that species darted down and hovered above her. Grasping her bill in his, he lifted her without apparent difficulty almost directly upward. About 3 feet from the ground the stunned bird slipped from his grasp and fell, whereupon he repeated the procedure with the same result. After lifting her about 3 feet for the third time and losing her, the male bird flew to a nearby shrub and perched there.

A few minutes later I picked up and examined the motionless female, and found her still alive. After a few minutes of rest in my wife's hands, the bird recovered and flew off normally.—WINTON WEYDEMAYER, *Fortine, Montana 59918*. Accepted 16 Jun. 70.